arXiv:1701.04362v1 [physics.atom-ph] 16 Jan 2017

Some radiative corrections to the hyperfine splitting of true muonium: two-photon-exchange contributions

Henry Lamm*
Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
(Dated: January 17, 2017)

The contributions of one-loop vacuum polarization insertions to the two-photon exchange to the true muonium hyperfine splitting arising from e and τ loops is obtained numerically for $m_\mu\alpha^6, m_\mu\alpha^7, m_\mu\alpha^8$. The contribution to the hyperfine splitting is $\frac{m_\mu\alpha^6}{\pi^2 n^3}\left[2.5109696(1) + 3.2458938(1)\frac{\alpha}{\pi} + 7.2434498(1)\frac{\alpha^2}{\pi}\right] \times 10^2 = 98447$ MHz. Additional results have been computed for other purely leptonic bound states, including the mass-independent α^8 contribution from this set of graphs.

True muonium is the yet unidentified $(\mu\bar{\mu})$ bound state with lifetimes on the order of ps [1]. QED dominates the characteristics of true muonium, while QCD and Electroweak effects appear at $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$ [2] and $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^7)$ [3] respectively. The "muon problem" whereby muon observables are in conflict with electron measurements and theory [4–8] motivate serious spectroscopic study of true muonium despite the difficulties. True muonium can discriminate between new physics models [9–30], systematic error in previous experiments, and subtle understandings of known physics [31–35] as solutions to the muon problem if the standard model predictions are known to 100 MHz, corresponding to $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^7)$ [36].

At present, the Heavy Photon Search (HPS) [37] experiment is searching for true muonium [38], and DImeson Relativistic Atom Complex (DIRAC) [39] has discussed a search during an upgraded run [40]. In both situations, the true muonium will be relativistic, necessitating consideration to the effect of boost on wave functions and production rates [41–43].

The theoretical expression for the hfs corrections to true muonium from QED can be written

$$\Delta E_{\rm hfs} = m_\mu\alpha^4\left[C_0 + C_1\frac{\alpha}{\pi} + C_{21}\alpha^2\ln\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) + C_{20}\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^2 + C_{32}\frac{\alpha^3}{\pi}\ln^2\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) + C_{31}\frac{\alpha^3}{\pi}\ln\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) + C_{30}\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^3 + \cdots\right], \quad (1)$$

where C_{ij} indicate the coefficient of the term proportional to $(\alpha)^i\ln^j(1/\alpha)$. C_{ij} include any dependence on mass scales other than m_μ. The coefficients of single-flavor QED bound states, used in positronium, are known up to $\mathcal{O}(m_e\alpha^6)$. Partial results exist for $\mathcal{O}(m_e\alpha^7)$ and are an active research area (For updated reviews of the coefficients see [44, 45]). The exchange $m_e \to m_\mu$ translates these results to true muonium.

True muonium receives further contributions that are neglected in positronium. The lighter electron allows for large vacuum loop contributions. The relative smallness of $m_\tau/m_\mu \approx 17$ and $m_\pi/m_\mu \approx 1.3$ produce contributions to true muonium much larger than for positronium. Of these contributions, which we denote by C^μ_{ij}, only a few terms are known. Ref. [46] presented calculations for a set of $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$ contributions from electron loops, $C^\mu_{1,e} = 1.684$.

Part of this is the non-recoil contributions arising from vacuum polarization in the Coulomb line with an additional transverse photon (VPC-T) and the vacuum polarization in a transverse photon (VPT) which naively scale as $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^6)$. In unequal-mass systems, loop momentum can introduce a factor of $1/\alpha$. While in muonium this splitting into non-recoil and recoil terms is sensible, as emphasized in [47] this decomposition is unnecessary in equal-mass systems and leads to further complications discussed below. The vacumm polarization insertions contribute to the theoretical uncertainty both through the finite precison of the current value of $C_{1,e}$ and the missing higher order terms and are therefore the largest current source of uncertainty.

The VPC-T contribution from [46] is found in Eq. (18), $\Delta E_{VPC-T} = 0.605\frac{\alpha}{\pi}E_F$ where E_F is the Fermi energy. There is an error either in the expression as printed or the result. We recomputed this expression numerically to obtain $\Delta E_{VPC-T} = 0.951\frac{\alpha}{\pi}E_F$. We are unable to resolve this discrepancy. If the value is in error, the vacuum polarization in a Coulomb line attached to the annihilation channel (denoted in Ref. [46] by VPC-A) will also be incorrect. In deriving Eq. (18) of [46] through the Green's function approach, a nontrivial dependence upon α is introduced via $x = \alpha m_\mu/m_e$. This expression is not only $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$, and mixes in contributions from higher orders clouding the desired decomposition of Eq. 1.

To clarify these issues, we compute the full radiative contribution at $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^6)$ from one-loop vacuum polarization insertions to two-photon exchange channel at $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^6)$. The contributions of n one-loop vacuum polarization insertions to the two-photon exchange channel scale as approximately $\alpha^{5+n}\frac{m_\mu}{m_e}^{1.5n}$. Given $m_\mu/m_e \approx 200 \approx \frac{1}{\alpha}$ implies that for accuracy at $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^7)$, we require terms up to order α^8. We compute the contribu-

* hlamm@umd.edu



FIG. 1. Radiative loop corrections from generic leptonic loops to the two photon exchange graph considered in this work.

tions for other ratios of $\beta = \left(\frac{m_\ell}{m_{\ell'}}\right)^2$ where ℓ indicates the valence leptons and ℓ' indicates the loop leptons following [45].

We start our calculations from the infrared-divergent skeleton diagram of the two-photon exchange obtained in the scattering approximation. It has a simple form [48–50]:

$$\Delta E = \frac{m\alpha^5}{\pi}\left[\frac{1}{3}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}q^2 f_p(q)\right], \tag{2}$$

where

$$f_p(q) = \frac{16+2q^2+q^4-q^3\sqrt{q^2+4}}{4q^3\sqrt{q^2+4}}. \tag{3}$$

This integral itself is infrared-divergent but all radiative insertions into the expression render it convergent.

We wish to consider the contributions from Fig. 1 with the one-loop polarization insertions given by

$$\frac{\alpha}{\pi}I_{1,\beta}(q) = \frac{\alpha}{\pi}\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}v \frac{v^2\left(1-\frac{v^2}{3}\right)}{(1-v^2)q^2+\frac{4}{\beta}}. \tag{4}$$

The contribution of n one-loop vacuum polarization insertions is obtained from Eq.(2) with $\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}q^2 I_{1,\beta}(q)\right)^n$ and the appropriate combinatoric factor. The integral over v can be performed analytically, and the resulting q^2 integral is

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E =& \frac{m\alpha^5}{\pi}\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^n\left[\frac{n+1}{3}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}q^2 f_p(q)\left(\frac{q^2\beta(12-5q^2\beta)+6(q^2\beta-2)\sqrt{q^2\beta(4+q^2\beta)}\,\mathrm{ArcTanh}\left(\frac{q^2\beta}{q^2\beta+4}\right)}{9q^4\beta^2}\right)^n\right]\\ =& \frac{m\alpha^5}{\pi}\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^n C_{n+1,vpx}\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the factor of $n+1$ reflects the combinatorics.

In the case of $\beta = 1$, we can analytically solve this equation for $n = 1, 2, 3$. Our results agree with previous calculations for $C_{2,vpx} = 5/9$ [47] and $C_{3,vpx} = \frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{6\pi^2}{35}-\frac{8}{9}\right)$ [49, 50]. The α^8 mass-independent contribution is $C_{4,vpx} = \frac{1}{127575}\left(-5255-2016\pi^2+51840\zeta(3)\right)$.

For values of $\beta \neq 1$, we numerically integrated Eq. 5 for $n = 1, 2, 3$ and the results are in Tab. I. The total contribution from these 3 terms in true muonium is $98150 + 295 + 2 = 98447$ MHz.

We fit a range $\beta = [10^{-7}, 10^7]$ to find the leading β scaling for each of these coefficients. The physics changes at $\beta = 1$, so we perform separate fits to β above and below 1. The results are found in Tab. II. We see that for $\beta < 1$, all three coefficients are nearly $C_{n,vpx} \propto \beta$ with small, but significant corrections. This is close to the naive scaling expectation. In contrast, for the case of $\beta > 1$ we find $C_{n,vpx} \propto \beta^{0.7-0.8}$ indicating that there is reduction from naive scaling.

Having found these contributions, we can reevaluate the estimate of uncertainties from missing terms from [3, 45]. The electron vacuum polarization corrections, which are the largest at $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$, were used to estimate the unknown $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$ corrections by multiplying the $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$ diagrams by the photon polarization function, $\Pi_R(q^2)$, that arises from the electron vacuum polarization at momentum $q^2 = 4m_\mu^2$. This method ignores the proper convolution and non-electronic contributions, but should give a gross estimate. The majority of $\mathcal{O}(m_\mu\alpha^5)$ contain two photon propagators, so we multiplied by 2,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta E^6_{hfs}|_\mu =& 2\Pi_R(4m_\mu^2)\Delta E^5_{hfs,\mathrm{remain}}\\ =& 6.92\,(0.336)\,\frac{m_\mu\alpha^6}{\pi^2} \approx 600\mathrm{MHz}\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\Delta E^5_{hfs,\mathrm{remain}}$ was obtained in [46] and here consist of the sum of the coefficients (g-2)-T, Vert-A, VP-μ-A,

TABLE I. Coefficients from two-photon exchange from one-loop leptonic vacuum polarization for physical values of β_{ij} where i is the valence lepton, and j is the lepton in the loop.

β	$C_{2,vpx\beta}$	$C_{3,vpx\beta}$	$C_{4,vpx\beta}$
$\beta_{e\tau} = 8.3 \times 10^{-8}$	$3.0946311(1) \times 10^{-7}$	$2.6420938(1) \times 10^{-8}$	$2.5388718(1) \times 10^{-8}$
$\beta_{e\mu} = 2.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.1110193(1) \times 10^{-5}$	$7.4715685(1) \times 10^{-6}$	$7.1799093(1) \times 10^{-6}$
$\beta_{\mu\tau} = 3.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.6932879(1) \times 10^{-3}$	$1.1262411(1) \times 10^{-3}$	$1.0851353(1) \times 10^{-3}$
$\beta_{\ell\ell} = 1$	$\frac{5}{9}$	$\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{6\pi^2}{35} - \frac{8}{9}\right)$	$\frac{1}{127575}\left(-5255 - 2016\pi^2 + 51840\zeta(3)\right)$
$\beta_{\tau\mu} = 2.8 \times 10^{2}$	$1.8415366(1) \times 10^{1}$	$1.9063960(1) \times 10^{1}$	$3.2945515(1) \times 10^{1}$
$\beta_{\mu e} = 4.3 \times 10^{4}$	$2.5109127(1) \times 10^{2}$	$3.2458825(1) \times 10^{2}$	$7.2434389(1) \times 10^{2}$
$\beta_{\tau e} = 1.2 \times 10^{7}$	$4.2838822(1) \times 10^{3}$	$5.8299707(1) \times 10^{3}$	$1.4253389(1) \times 10^{4}$

TABLE II. Power law dependence extracted from fits to numerically integrated results for $C_{n,vpx} \propto \beta^{\kappa_\pm}$ where $\kappa_\pm$ indicates the result fro $\beta > 1$ and $\beta < 1$ respectively.

$C_{n,vpx}$	κ_+	κ_-
$n = 2$	0.880(3)	1.082(1)
$n = 3$	0.767(4)	1.013(1)
$n = 4$	0.720(6)	1.0031(4)

VPC-A, VP-e-A, and VP-h-A. Compared with with previous result [45] of 700 MHz, we reduced it to 600 MHz. In conclusion, several critical corrections to the hyperfine splitting of true muonium are now known. The $C_{2,vpx}|_\mu$ contributions for true muonium supersede previous calculations where they were partially computed and attributed to C_1. We have further computed $C_{n+1,vpx\beta}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$ for all value of β that are physically relevant. The total energy shift in true muonium is 98447 MHz. The computation of these missing C_2 contributions further reduces the uncertainty estimate due to missing contributions from 700 to 600 MHz. In light of this work, the largest remaining uncertainty is the VPC-A contribution.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

HL is supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. PHY-1068286 and PHY-1403891 and by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-FG02-93ER-40762.

[1] S. J. Brodsky and R. F. Lebed, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 213401 (2009), arXiv:0904.2225 [hep-ph].
[2] H. Lamm, (2016), arXiv:1611.04258 [physics.atom-ph].
[3] H. Lamm, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 073008 (2015).
[4] G. Bennett *et al.* (Muon G-2 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. **D73**, 072003 (2006), arXiv:hep-ex/0602035 [hep-ex].
[5] A. Antognini *et al.*, Science **339**, 417 (2013).
[6] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014), arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex].
[7] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 111803 (2015), [Addendum: Phys. Rev. Lett.115,no.15,159901(2015)], arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex].
[8] R. Pohl *et al.* (CREMA), Science **353**, 669 (2016).
[9] D. Tucker-Smith and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 101702 (2011), arXiv:1011.4922 [hep-ph].
[10] J. Jaeckel and S. Roy, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 125020 (2010), arXiv:1008.3536 [hep-ph].
[11] B. Batell, D. McKeen, and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 011803 (2011), arXiv:1103.0721 [hep-ph].
[12] V. Barger, C.-W. Chiang, W.-Y. Keung, and D. Marfatia, Phys.Rev.Lett. **108**, 081802 (2012), arXiv:1109.6652 [hep-ph].
[13] S. G. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. **A83**, 062119 (2011), arXiv:1005.4875 [hep-ph].
[14] S. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 220406 (2010), arXiv:1005.4859 [hep-ph].
[15] S. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 113013 (2010), arXiv:1005.4868 [hep-ph].
[16] S. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 073003 (2010), arXiv:1005.4872 [hep-ph].
[17] S. Karshenboim and V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. **A84**, 064502 (2011), arXiv:1110.6259 [physics.atom-ph].
[18] S. G. Karshenboim, D. McKeen, and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 073004 (2014), arXiv:1401.6154 [hep-ph].
[19] C. E. Carlson and B. C. Rislow, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 035013 (2012), arXiv:1206.3587 [hep-ph].
[20] C. E. Carlson and M. Freid, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 095024 (2015), arXiv:1506.06631 [hep-ph].
[21] E. Izaguirre, G. Krnjaic, and M. Pospelov, Phys. Lett. **B740**, 61 (2015), arXiv:1405.4864 [hep-ph].
[22] J. Kopp, L. Michaels, and J. Smirnov, JCAP **1404**, 022 (2014), arXiv:1401.6457 [hep-ph].
[23] J. C. Martens and J. P. Ralston, (2016), arXiv:1606.06209 [hep-ph].
[24] Y.-S. Liu, D. McKeen, and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 101801 (2016), arXiv:1605.04612 [hep-ph].
[25] R. Onofrio, Europhys.Lett. **104**, 20002 (2013), arXiv:1312.3469 [hep-ph].
[26] L.-B. Wang and W.-T. Ni, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A28**, 1350094 (2013), arXiv:1303.4885 [hep-ph].
[27] A. H. Gomes, A. Kostelecký, and A. J. Vargas, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 076009 (2014), arXiv:1407.7748 [hep-ph].
[28] P. Brax and C. Burrage, Phys.Rev. **D90**, 104009 (2014).
[29] H. Lamm, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 055007 (2015),

arXiv:1505.00057 [hep-ph].
[30] H. Lamm, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 115007 (2016), arXiv:1609.07520 [hep-ph].
[31] U. D. Jentschura, Phys. Rev. **A88**, 062514 (2013), arXiv:1401.3666 [physics.atom-ph].
[32] G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. **C91**, 055204 (2015), arXiv:1501.01036 [nucl-th].
[33] J. R. Stryker and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. **A93**, 012509 (2016), arXiv:1508.06680 [hep-ph].
[34] C. P. Burgess, P. Hayman, M. Rummel, M. Williams, and L. Zalavari, (2016), arXiv:1612.07334 [hep-ph].
[35] C. P. Burgess, P. Hayman, M. Rummel, and L. Zalavari, (2016), arXiv:1612.07337 [hep-ph].
[36] H. Lamm, in *Twelfth International Conference on the Intersections of Particle and Nuclear Physics, Vail, CO, USA, May 19-24, 2015* (2015) arXiv:1509.09306 [hep-ph].
[37] A. Celentano (HPS), J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **556**, 012064 (2014).
[38] A. Banburski and P. Schuster, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 093007 (2012), arXiv:1206.3961 [hep-ph].
[39] A. Benelli (DIRAC Collaboration), EPJ Web Conf. **37**, 01011 (2012).
[40] P. Chliapnikov, DIRAC-NOTE-2014-05 (2014).
[41] H. Lamm and R. F. Lebed, J.Phys. **G41**, 125003 (2014), arXiv:1311.3245 [hep-ph].
[42] H. Lamm and R. F. Lebed, *Proceedings, Theory and Experiment for Hadrons on the Light-Front (Light Cone 2015)*, (2016), 10.1007/s00601-016-1075-3, [Few Body Syst.1,5(2016)], arXiv:1601.05771 [hep-ph].
[43] H. Lamm and R. Lebed, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 016004 (2016), arXiv:1606.06358 [hep-ph].
[44] G. S. Adkins and R. N. Fell, Phys. Rev. **A89**, 052518 (2014), arXiv:1402.7040 [hep-ph].
[45] Y. Ji and H. Lamm, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 032507 (2016).
[46] U. Jentschura, G. Soff, V. Ivanov, and S. G. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. **A56**, 4483 (1997), arXiv:physics/9706026 [physics].
[47] J. R. Sapirstein, E. A. Terray, and D. R. Yennie, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 2290 (1984).
[48] M. I. Eides and H. Grotch, Phys. Rev. **A52**, 1757 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9411220 [hep-ph].
[49] M. I. Eides and V. A. Shelyuto, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 111301 (2014), arXiv:1403.7947 [hep-ph].
[50] M. I. Eides and V. A. Shelyuto, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 013010 (2015), arXiv:1506.00175 [hep-ph].